

## REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated November 28, 2005, which has a shortened statutory period set to expire February 28, 2006.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-2, and 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamada (US 6328418).


Claim is amended herein to recite (in pertinent part):

A...print head comprising:


an ejector base having opposing first and second edges aligned parallel to the first print direction and opposing third and fourth edges aligned parallel to the second printing direction; and

a first plurality of ejectors mounted in the ejector base, the first plurality of ejectors being arranged in a first line, the first line being diagonal to the first print direction and the second print direction.

Support for the amendment to Claim 1 is clearly shown in Applicants' Figs. 4b and 4c, copied below for reference in a modified form that indicates the "first", "second", "third" and "fourth" edges of the ejector bases 431b and 431c:




**Fig. 4b**



**Fig. 4c**

Yamada teaches a conventional rectangular print head in which ejectors are aligned parallel to long edges of a ejector base (module) 1 (see, e.g., Yamada's Fig. 3, copied below for reference):

FIG. 3



Yamada fails to anticipate Claim 1 at least because Yamada fails to teach or suggest "an ejector base having opposing first and second edges aligned parallel to the first print direction and opposing third and fourth edges aligned parallel to the second printing direction; and a first plurality of ejectors mounted in the ejector base, the first plurality of ejectors

being arranged in a first line, the first line being diagonal to the first print direction and the second print direction", as recited in amended Claim 1.

Claims 2 and 4-9 depend from Claim 1, and are therefore allowable over Yamada for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 2, and 4-9.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 102.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamada in view of a legal precedent.

Claim 3 is dependent from Claim 1, which is distinguished over Yamada for the reasons set forth above. Claim 3 is also believed to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yamada. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of Claim 3.

#### New Claims

Claims 10-20 are newly entered.

Similar to Claim 1, Claim 10 recites (in pertinent part):

A printing system comprising:  
a stage for supporting a substrate;  
a print head including:  
    an ejector base, and  
    a plurality of ejectors mounted in the  
ejector base;  
means for moving the print head in a first  
print direction and a second print direction  
across a substrate without changing a rotational  
orientation of the print head relative to the  
substrate, the first print direction and the  
second print direction being nonparallel; and

means for causing the plurality ejectors to selectively eject material toward the substrate when the print head is moving in either of the first printing direction and the second printing direction,

wherein the first plurality of ejectors are arranged on the ejector base in a first line, the first line being diagonal to the first print direction and the second print direction.

Due to the similarities between the language of Claim 10 and that of Claim 1, support for Claim 10 is similar to that of Claim 1, and Claim 10 is believed to be distinguished over Yamada for reasons similar to those provided above with reference to Claim 1. In addition, Claim 10 is further distinguished over Yamada in that Yamada fails to teach or suggest "means for causing the plurality ejectors to selectively eject material toward the substrate when the print head is moving in either of the first printing direction and the second printing direction". No new matter is entered.

Claims 11-18, which recited subject matter similar to Claims 2-9, respectively, are dependent from Claim 10, and are therefore believed to be distinguished over Yamada for at least the reasons provided above with reference to Claim 10.

Claims 19 and 20 recite alignment features disclosed, for example, in Fig. 2 (camera 270) and discussed in Applicants' paragraphs 0058-0062. No new matter is entered.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present Application. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

If there are any questions, please telephone the undersigned at (408) 451-5902 to expedite prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No.: 33726

Patrick T. Bever  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 33,834

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as FIRST CLASS MAIL in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on February 27, 2006.

2/27/2006  
Date

Rebecca A. Baumann  
Signature: Rebecca A. Baumann